DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 642 HE 013 406

AUTHOR Dorsey, Rhoda M.
TITLE Institutional Planning.
INSTITUTION Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 80
NOTE 13p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; *College Role; *Evaluation Criteria; *Governing Boards; Higher Education; *Long Range Planning; Master Plans; Private Colleges; Self Evaluation (Groups); State Colleges; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

The role of college trustees in institutional planning is considered with emphasis on the development of a long-range plan of the five-year variety. The analysis is also applicable to shorter-range planning and to the formulation of an annual budget. Trustees of private colleges must insist that planning be done, since, unlike the public sector, there is no legislative mandate for planning. The attitudes of board members and the kinds of questions they ask about a plan are important to the ultimate quality of the effort. Trustees need to insure that trustworthy data are available and that plans are realistic and feasible. In addition to involving nonacademic staff at all levels in the planning process, trustees must see that planning is done on a schedule that allows for deliberation, consultation, and revision, and they must be prepared to incur extra expenses in the effort. As the plan goes into operation, the board should require a schedule for reconsideration and revision and should initiate monitoring of the plan. It is also important that board members be aware of state master plans and the activities of state coordinating bodies, since these functions affect both the public and private sectors. Assumptions on which college planning rest include both internal matters, such as enrollment trends, and external conditions, such as the rate of inflation. The plan should include a statement of institutional mission and goals and should specify concrete programs designed to attain the goals. Evaluation as a basis future planning and the special responsibilities of the chairman of the board are considered. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE 013 406

ED197642

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACB

Institutional Planning

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Rhoda M. Dorsey

Rhoda M. Dorsey is president of Goucher College (Towson, Maryland). A historian by academic profession, Dr. Dorsey is chairperson of the Women's College Coalition and first vice-chairperson of the Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, and a member of the board of directors of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Her Pocket Publication is condensed from a chapter she contributed to the *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship* (1979).

© 1980 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.
Printed in the United States of America
October, 1980

All institutions engage in some kind of planning, although the plans produced vary widely in character, candor, and usefulness. At the minimum, a small college has a budget for the coming year; at the maximum, a large university that is part of a state system probably has a detailed five-year plan, filling a good-sized book and covering everything from enrollment and staff size to equipment replacement costs. Some plans are generated entirely within an institution and reflect little except that institution's aspirations. Others, prepared on forms mandated by state educational authorities, are circumscribed in content and form by governmental as well as institutional considerations. Planning in most small institutions is done by faculty or staff who are not planners by training and are temporary planners only by designation; planning in large institutions is usually done by formally trained planners with considerable staff to assist them.

However the planning is done and whatever the nature of the plan, the members of a board of trustees have a vital part to play in the institutional planning process—a part that goes far beyond putting their signatures to the plan in its final form. They must, of course approve institutional plans as a proper exercise of their fiduciary responsibility. But they can also help to initiate and improve planning, and they can take an active role in the formulation of a plan. Although the following discussion centers largely on the development of a long-range plan of the five-year variety, its observations about trustee responsibilities and roles are also applicable to shorter-range planning and to the formulation of an annual budget.

The nature of planning

Academic planning has some peculiar features of its own, but in its main characteristics does not differ from that done in the corporate world. It is an attempt to define where the institution wants to go, how and when it will arrive there, with whom it will travel, and what the cost of the trip will be. Obviously, in any such effort the farther away the future is, the more uncertain and less detailed the plan can be. It is useful to remember this fact, since the amassing of quantities of numbers, which is a feature of most plans, and the projection of these numbers into a time frame of two to five years often give the illusion that the projections are themselves as solid as the current information and data on which they are based. In fact, the farther plans move from the present, the greater the chance of error. This is why long-range plans rarely reach beyond a five-year span, and why all plans need to be updated annually by careful revision and not simply by moving figures projected earlier into the current-year column.

Many a plan has proved useless because, once made, it was left unrevised while the future brought circumstances very different from those envisaged by the original projection.

On the other hand, many elaborate plans have been printed up only to be put on a shelf and forgotten. Plans are made to be questioned and revised, but they are also made to be carried out.

Board responsibilities for planning

The first responsibility of trustees in relation to institutional planning is to insist that it be done. Leaving aside for the moment the public sector, where planning usually is mandated by legislation, it must be noted that most institutions in the private sector have not routinely and systematically engaged in planning. This is particularly true of the mass of small private institutions. There especially, planning has been largely intuitive and reactive, not systematic and predictive.

An insistence that planning take place may well meet at first with apathy and inertia, not only in the institution but among board members as well. It is curious that the very corporate board members who are most insistent on planning for their own enterprises seem not to understand that planning is just as important for a college or university. Indeed, one of the first groups that has to be persuaded of the urgen-

cy of the endeavor is commonly the board itself. Until the board asserts its own determination to give planning a major role, effective planning will not be achieved.

The second responsibility of a board in relation to planning is to see that it is done well. This does not mean that the board itself should do the planning; a board by its nature cannot undertake the mass of detailed work that is involved. Board members must, however, make sure that the kind of planning others are doing and that will ultimately be brought to them for inspection, debate, and decision is of high quality. Some of this quality can be guaranteed in a mechanical way—for example, by assigning adequate staff—but much of it will be determined by the attitudes of board members and the kinds of questions they ask about a plan.

A good plan must be based on adequate data and information and the two are not precisely the same. Data are raw material, frequently (but by no means always in academic planning) numerical in nature. Data that have been interpreted to make them more intelligible and pertinent to considerations at hand become information. In recent years both the generation and use of data within colleges and universities have improved. The data and information with which trustees are probably most familiar and that they are best able to judge are financial. Financial data are certainly important in planning, but the range of data required to plan for the institution as a whole is much broader. It covers material on output programs such as instruction, research, and public service and on support programs such as student services, administration, plant operation and auxiliary enterprises, as well as on the budgets on which all these activities are based.

Trustworthy data are needed in all these areas, and board members must make certain that such data are available in the institution.

Trustees must also insist that plans be realistic and feasible. If a plan is to be of any help, it must reflect the institution clearly, warts and all. Whether an institution contemplates strengthening a traditional position or moving into a new one, it needs honesty in its appraisal of itself. Similarly, in an evaluation of conditions in the world outside the institution, whether it is the local community, the surrounding educational community, the nation, or the world as a whole, realism is critical.

A general responsibility of trustees is to look out for the institution as a whole. This concern translates itself into a third responsibility in planning: to ensure that the plan covers all aspects of the institution. While this does not necessarily mean that action will be required in all areas, it is difficult to think of any academic initiatives these days that do not involve substantial parts of the institution in addition to the academic departments.

Evidence of this institution-wide purview is input received from the nonfaculty, nonstudent constituencies of the institution. The academic plan, given the tradition in most American institutions, will be drawn up largely by the faculty, and students will have a good deal to say about the area of student services. But administrative staff at all levels need to be involved in those segments of the plan that relate to staff operations, and alumni should also have a chance to contribute. Many institutions, especially but not solely community colleges, will wish to provide input from members of the community.

As a fourth responsibility, trustees must see to it that when planning is undertaken, for the first time or in its regular cycle, it is done on a schedule that allows for deliberation, consultation, decision making, and revision that will ensure completion of the plan in a manageable period of time. The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) has a helpful guide for such scheduling called *A College Planning Cycle* (1975). In "How Stanford Plans,"* Miller reports on the experiences of a large institution that oper-

AGB Reports, September/October, 1978

ates on a two-year planning cycle. In any schedule, time for discussion is particularly important because decisions to be reached by means of the plan are frequently not easy ones and the real issues may not emerge until the plan has been worked on for a long time.

There is a great temptation, especially the first time around on a plan, for everyone to linger over the initial steps, postponing the moment for final decisions. Trustees must not accept a schedule that allows this to happen, even if the first plan thus turns out to be inadequate. It is better to have gone through the process and produced a spotty plan than never to have finished, provided the process is then reactivated and the second try is better than the first.

If a plan is to be done well, it will cost time and money, and trustees as their fifth responsibility must be prepared to incur such expenses. Planning requires extra work by almost everyone in an institution, from the faculty member examining departmental course offerings to the director of physical plant estimating gas and oil usage, but it is a mistake to try to draw this material together without some additional staffing at the collection point. Large institutions generally have a planning officer with major responsibility for planning; small institutions frequently do not have such an officer and may attempt to plan without additional help. This is poor economy. Quality planning requires someone with a clear, logical mind, an understanding of the institution, and the ability to work with others and inspire them to work. Faculty, with some training and released time, can make excellent part-time planners and may, for a variety of political as well as personnel reasons, be a wise choice for small institutions.

At some point in the planning process, outside consultants may also be used. They are best called in when there is a need for information that is technical in its nature and/or political in its implications. In small institutions, it requires a degree of expertise not usually present among campus personnel to prepare calculations about mechanical maintenance and replacement or about the installation of equipment to improve energy usage. Outside consultants can do this.

On a campus of any size outside consultants may well be employed, for both technical and political reasons, in planning for improved use of space. It is far easier for faculty or staff with a highly developed sense of territoriality to discuss space needs with a dispassionate outside expert than to fight it out among themselves, and they are more apt to pay attention to what an outsider says than to the proposals of their peers.

Finally, it goes without saying that if the board is to play an effective part in planning, it must have members who are capable of giving help in developing and evaluating a plan. This does not necessarily mean they must be professional planners, but they should be individuals with expertise in finance, in engineering, in academic and student affairs, and in development.

Accepting the plan

When the plan has been completed, it is the responsibility of the board first to accept it and then to help bring it to fulfillment. Acceptance should be more than *pro forma* acquiescence. Board members must be able to say no to parts of a plan that they find unacceptable and persist until the necessary changes have been made. They must then be sure that the plan is communicated clearly and effectively to all parts of the college community and, in appropriate form, to outside constituencies whose support is being sought. The plan will thus become a guide for the institution as a whole and a picture of the developing institution for those outside it.

As the plan goes into operation, the board should require a schedule for reconsideration and revision, thus initiating a repetition, smaller in scale but similar in process, of the original plan-making procedure. At the same time, monitoring should begin in a regular way. Thoughtful monitoring requires close cooperation between board

members and the college administration so that there is no infringement on staff functions. Board members are not on the board to run programs but to receive and evaluate information about their operation, especially in relation to the plan.

Monitoring can show where a plan may be faulty. Suppose that a new academic program is offered but enrollment does not materialize. Monitoring the plan will encourage analysis of why the program failed and suggestions for alternate planning. Monitoring also shows whether a plan is being achieved or not. Perhaps targets in the plan for increased student services or building renovation or fund-raising are not being met. Board members need to know this fact and then need to know why, especially if the initial plan was sound but has been neglected or disregarded. In addition, board members need to concern themselves, through monitoring, with situations in which a desired part of the plan is rendered irrelevant, as when, for example, a planned community service is made unnecessary by provision of such services by another agency.

State boards and master plans

In the public sector, growing layers of authority have drastically revised the traditional role of institutional board members, while state master plans for education have proliferated. These developments have left many board members feeling that they have little role to play in institutional planning. Many others, however, have shown themselves masters of bureaucratic and political infighting in establishing for their institution the mission they think desirable. This new kind of trustee activity has taken place not in the board room but in the legislature.

The growth of state coordinating bodies for higher education and the development of state master plans also have implications for the private sector that board members should take into account. State coordinating bodies have authority over the private sector as well, although it is not of the same kind or magnitude as their authority over the public sector. In its study and subsequent closing of weak doctoral programs, the New York State Board of Regents dealt with private as well as public sector programs and closed some in both sectors. The attempt to limit repetitive programs is apparently going to be extended to the private as well as the public sector and perhaps with more devastating effect in view of the size and political weakness of most private institutions. State coordinating bodies and state master plans rarely chart the future for the private sector, but their planning for the public sector may have immediate impact on enrollment and programs in private institutions. It is therefore extremely important that board members be aware of the outlines of state master plans and the activities of state coordinating bodies. At times, their voices, like the vices of public board members, may well be needed to help in discussions that are educational in subject but frequently political in context.

Board role in the planning process

All plans rest on assumptions about the future, and one of the first steps in devising a plan is to make these assumptions explicit. Board members can be of particular value in this exercise, bringing perspectives that help to widen the academic aperture. Assumptions should cover both internal matters, including affairs over which the college can exercise some matters as student enrollment, student attrition, size and remuneration of faculty, teaching load, student housing arrangements, scope of the athletic program, number of community service programs, investment in physical plant, and state of the endowment. Under the second category come factors such as the rate of inflation, national and regional demographic trends, the cost of energy, projected employment rates for both the nation and the region, public attitudes toward higher education, the amount of federal and state support available, and the nature of federal and state policy on higher education.

Assumptions must be made about all these factors and many more with the awareness that there is little certainty about any assumption, especially if it involves a matter that lies beyond the institution's control. It thus becomes tempting to agonize over assumptions and to allow their uncertainty to generate uncertainty about the entire planning process. Neither board members nor administrators have the luxury to do this. Assumptions must be arrived at in a tough-minded way and with full use made of the board members' wide experience.

At their best, assumptions are educated guesses whose quality will vary widely depending on the experience of trustees and administrators. Their part in the planning process is to force everyone to think about fundamental factors that will influence the future of the institution, whether those factors can be controlled or not. Formulating assumptions forces everyone to think not only about the assumptions that they will eventually adopt but also about alternate conditions that might arise. What, for example, would happen to the institution if the inflation rate were not 10 percent but 15 percent? What if day enrollment remained steady but night enrollment increased by 30 percent? What if overall enrollment dropped by 10 percent? What if federal aid to medical students suddenly stopped? What if faculty became unionized? What if the draft were reinstituted? In larger and more sophisticated institutions, "what if" questions like the above have led to the use of computer programs that make it possible to change assumptions mechanically and have an instant indication of the result. Smaller institutions will have to trust the brains of their administrators and board members in going through the same process.

Statement of mission and statement of goals

The first part of the plan proper is a statement of institutional mission. The mission statement should be a brief evocative statement dealing with the institution's particular type of educational mission. At the minimum, the mission statement should designate certain fundamental characteristics of the institution, e.g., whether it is public or independent, large of small, freestanding or linked with a system; the nature of its academic program; whether it has a particular constituency, and whether the mission is historic or newly adopted.

Closely allied to the mission statement and flowing from it is the statement of institutional goals, usually made in the form of lists of specific goals. Statements of institutional goals tend to be broader than mission statements in that they cover all areas of institutional activity, and more specific in that they attempt to refine the generalized rhetoric that is characteristic of mission statements. Together, mission and goals statements characterize the institution for itself, its students, and the outside world. At their best, they give guidelines for the development of academic and nonacademic institutional programs and a yardstick against which institutional activities may be evaluated. They are, therefore, enormously important to an institution, and trustees must play an important part in their development.

Traditionally, goals statements have focused to a very considerable extent on academic programs and student outcomes. The Institutional Goals Inventory is an instrument designed by the Educational Testing Service to help in identification and assessment of goals (how important each is, how important it should be). It lists 90 goals, dealing largely with educational outcomes, service to the community and the campus operations and activities that affect achievement of educational goals. Among the IGI "outcome goals," for example, are academic development, individual personal development, cultural/esthetic awareness, traditional religiousness, vocational preparation, research and public service.

The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems suggests several areas of program classification, including instruction, research, public

service, academic support programs, student services and institutional support programs. It then breaks these areas down into specifics. For example, "Student Services" is subdivided into student service administration, social and cultural development, counseling and career guidance, student health/medical services, student auxiliary services, and intercollegiate athletics.

Mission and goals statements should be presented to the board while they are still in a reasonably fluid state so that board members' comments can make some difference. At the time of the board meeting, it may be profitable to abandon the usual pattern of a general meeting of all board members and break up into small groups, each led by a trustee. On the assumption that these small groups will have comments to make and questions to raise, their meetings should be followed by a meeting of the whole, during which reports of each of the small meetings can be made and points for consideration listed on a blackboard. Such a procedure helps to ensure that important matters are given serious thought, that trustees who are knowledgeable in particular areas have a chance to share their knowledge, and that communication among board members themselves and between board members and members of the administration in attendance will improve.

It is desirable in all institutions, though easier in smaller ones, to have input on goals and mission from all constituencies. One problem in getting a planning process to run smoothly is determining the times at which different groups should have their say about the plan. This is not simply a scheduling problem, since it frequently involves political considerations, as well as questions of authority and responsibility. The faculty and students, for instance, need to have a say in goals and mission statements at a time when their comments will have some impact. It may, in fact, be convenient to show a first draft of such statements to them before showing it to the trustees; college calendars do not always allow for the best possible sequence of discussions. However the schedule works, faculty and students need to understand that the final responsibility for adopting a mission and goals statement rests in the private sector with the board of the institution and in the public sector with the board of the institution or segment in conjunction with the state coordinating body.

Next step: the programs

The next logical step in the planning process is the elaboration of concrete programs designed to attain the stated goals. Actually, institutional planning being what it is, its various stages often run parallel in time and sometimes in reverse order. It is possible to derive a mission statement from programs that are in operation; in fact, many institutions do just this when developing long-range plans. If an institution has been running properly and successfully and the future promises no major surprises, one should be able to move from programs to mission as well as from mission to programs without any disjunction. It is the additional object of program definition, however, to encourage each department—administrative as well as academic—to examine the institution's goals and see how it can help to implement them.

There are many parts of an institutional plan with which board members, especially of an independent institution, feel immediately at home. Finances, facilities, and development are areas where trustees have routinely played a major role, not only in defining policy but in monitoring operations and helping to achieve objectives. In small colleges the finance committee will be responsible for receiving all sections of an institutional plan together with their projected costs. In larger institutions intermediate committees—frequently composed of faculty and students as well as staff—may receive projected programs and make recommendations to the finance committee of the board. This committee must consider total costs and determine whether there are resources available to meet them from tuition, endowment income, state grants, gifts, or unrelated business income.

If the plan cannot be financed, it is the responsibility of the finance committee to face the fact honestly and either indicate the need for trimming or attempt to raise more revenue. If additional revenue cannot be raised, it is the responsibility of the committee to develop, with the administration, some guidelines for scaling down programs and then to inform all departments. Stanford University, recognizing the fact that it is extraordinarily difficult to put projected programs in precise priority order, used the following criteria to judge their merit*:

1. Is the program academically important?
2. Is there now and will there continue to be a student interest?
3. Can we as an institution be outstanding in this program?
4. Can the program be securely funded?

These questions of course, do not apply to nonacademic programs, but they suggest an approach that may help those who have to make judgments about the funding of a range of programs.

The buildings and grounds committee, at a time of long-range planning, must concern itself with an extension of its regular concerns: the deferred and regular maintenance, the appropriateness of facilities for proposed programs, the need for new facilities or for remodeling old facilties, as well as questions of safety, access for the handicapped, and energy management—and all of these over a long-range period. Many campuses have come to a point where deferred maintenance has created hazardous, if not ruinous conditions, and it can no longer be put off.

Finally, the development committee of the board, addressing the plan as it comes from the finance committee, must determine the institution's ability to raise additional support, analyze the gift potential of segments of the plan, and then help to raise the money. It may well be the development and not the finance committee that is most immediately responsible for forcing the alterations of a plan. If it cannot come up with the funds estimated by the finance committee as necessary, there will have to be some revision of programs or even of goals. At the same time, a really good plan may inspire a development committee to new heights.

The role of each of these three trustee committees will of course be different in the public sector. It is the legislative budget analyst rather than a group of trustees who may well have the last word on projected expenditures. It may be a planning department in conjunction with an appropriations committee that will approve proposals for building, rebuilding, or repair on a public campus. And although most state institutions have in recent years established development committees, their work has typically not had the importance for the overall budget that is characteristic of such committees in private institutions.

Planning in the areas of academic program and student services is obviously a critical part of institutional planning; it is planning for the fundamental activity of the institution. These are, however, two areas in which trustees in recent years have taken relatively little part. Responsibility for academic program was handed over to the faculty long ago; more recently student affairs have also generally moved out of the control of the board. With all due respect to the tradition of shared authority that these moves embody, it is at least open to question whether planning in these areas—given the enormous implications they carry for the future of the institution—should be done without some trustee participation. If trustees are expected to carry out, work for, and support a plan, ways must be found for them to take an appropriate part in the planning process for academic and student affairs. To suggest that there is one successful patern for trustee involvement would be misleading. The mechanics of the process are easier in a smaller institution, where an academic planning commmittee of faculty, students, and trustees can be established, but it may be easier politically in a bigger institution, where

AGB Reports, September/October, 1978

visiting and advisory committees of trustees and outside experts are more common.

Board members who sit on such committees need to observe particular discretion. They must insist that they are only individual committee members and cannot be regarded as the voice, spirit, or power of the board itself. They cannot act as all-knowing experts but must, instead, act as outside members, bringing an outside perspective and asking the kinds of questions that lead insiders to explain and understand their own ideas better. Necessary for this kind of task are trustees who know the institution, have sensitivity to faculty and student feelings abo elf-government, and feel at ease talking with faculty and students. It is usually helpful if one or more are alumni of the institution. If such board members are found, the broad-based planning committees can go to work tackling questions that deal with the shape of the curriculum in the future, the kind of faculty necessary to teach that curriculum, and the support services that will be required. On the student-life side, the planning committees can consider the kind and nature of student services, the facilities they will require, and the staffing they will need to be successful. In this way, trustees will be able to participate in relating mission and goals to programs in the academic and student services.

Board participation in the making of the plan, as suggested above, will require time, study, and thought from board members. There are, however, benefits to be derived from this effort that are worth keeping in mind. Participation brings an increase in knowledge of the institution, and usually increased interest. Participation makes it possible for board members to contribute their special expertise in a way that will be of immediate value to the institution. It involves board members early in the planning process and makes the plan, in a real sense, theirs; this is important, for a board member must feel a commitment to a plan before he or she will work to make it succeed.

Although little has been written specifically on the politics and psychology of long-range planning in an institution, no one who has been through the process can fail to recognize their importance. Institutional planning is now being done for a period that unfortunately combines contraction in student population with continuing high inflation. Planning may be the only way an institution can survive such a period, but it is planning that has a gloomy edge. Planning for contraction or for maintaining a steady state does not bring the elation that planning for expansion does, and it must be done in such a way that it will not cause the college community to lose heart. It is critical that within the plan attention be given to faculty development, to faculty salaries, and to faculty recommendations for the alternate use of space. There must b.. signs that the institution has concern for faculty who are caught in changing circumstances and that it has a forward-looking plan to help them adjust to new conditions. By displaying both caution and confidence, institutional planners may prevent a sinking-ship syndrome from sweeping over faculty.

Monitoring and testing

The final responsibility of the board member in relation to the plan is to help make it work and to use evaluation of its operation as the basis for future planning. Trustee committees should regularly review and revise those sections of the plan they are responsible for. The board itself ought to have an update and forward projection each year. It would help if key sections of the plan could routinely become the subjects for board consideration at meetings . A plan, however, is more than a subject for discussion; it is also a set of guidelines and objectives, and the board needs to be satisfied that, once a plan has been set in motion, its schedule is being met. This means that the board must consider how it will monitor the plan and what kind of information it will require for this task. This should be the subject of agreement among the board, the

president, and the planning officer. It is then the responsibility of the president to get the material to the board, indicating how the plan is being fulfilled or, if it is not being fulfilled, why it is not.

The last point is important, because if the plan is looked upon as an ironclad set of performance specifications, it will only stifle individual initiative and may well get the institution into great trouble. Any plan needs flexibility, and the board needs to be willing to consider proposals for changing a plan when its own committees, the planners of the institution, or the administration makes a good case for a change. Some change will come routinely with the yearly review of the plan. Consideration of change at other times, however, should always be possible, since conditions now change so rapidly. In summary, the board should be the masters of the plan and not the other way around. The following questions provide a means to test the adequacy of a proposed plan:

1. Is it based on a realistic assessment of the institution and its resources? Are working assumptions made clear?
2. Do the various sections employ adequate data bases? Are key data interpreted to allow for comprehensible implications to be stated?
3. Have all parts of the operation of the institution been covered?
4. Has the plan taken adequate account of outside forces that may affect costs, enrollment, and the attractiveness of offerings?
5. How does the plan affect resource allocation within the institution? How does it affect fund raising?
6. Have appropriate sections of the college community contributed input to the plan? Are they adequately informed as to its nature and guidelines?
7. Has consideration been given to the ways in which the validity and achievement of parts of the plan can be evaluated?

Special responsibilities of the chairman

In any long-range planning process, there are special responsibilities for the chairman of the board. The chairman should be the animating presence of the board, its leader as well as its conductor. There is little hope that a board can be convinced of the importance of planning if the chairman is not. The chairman must always keep the planning responsibilities of the board before himself or herself and the other board members. In those cases where board participation in planning is a new experience, it is the chairman who must help to educate the board as a whole about the aims, process, and results of institutional planning. It will require a good deal of talking, explaining, and perhaps persuading to achieve the kind of board participation that has been presented in this essay as appropriate. But if the chairman takes planning seriously, other board members will too.

The chairman needs also to keep nudging the president to make sure that the planning process is moving ahead according to an agreed upon schedule. As the process continues, the attitude of the chairman should be one of support, understanding, and determination. As a first planning effort gets under way, the chairman must emphasize that, while there will be mistakes and errors in information and judgment, these can be reviewed and rectified as the planning process becomes a continuous one within the institution. Some praise from the chairman for those involved in working on the plan at the trustee, faculty, staff, or student level is always a help.

Planning is hard work, and recognition of that fact by the chairman is a very considerable morale booster. It is the chairman, too, who must insist that the extra help needed for the process be provided. The regular communication between the president and the chairman should be the chief vehicle for constant monitoring of the process by the chairman. Finally, a degree of leadership and courage will always be a necessity for the chairman's role. Plans nowadays are apt to cut out more things than they add. Thus, the chairman must be able to move forward while thinking smaller and to sustain the morale of the board and the institution while this is taking place.

Additional information on institutional planning is available from AGB's Trustee Information Clearinghouse. Dial the Trustee's HOTLINE 202/296-4865 for answers to these and other governance questions.

A filmstrip, "The Board's Role in Institutional Planning," is also available to AGB members for a modest rental fee. Call or write AGB for more information.